

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-12, 15, and 17-20 are presently pending. Claims 1, 12, 15, and 17-19 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

In the Response to Arguments section of the pending final Office Action, the Examiner refutes a non-analogous art argument. However, applicants did not make a non-analogous art argument in their previous response. On page 7, lines 9-13 of their previous response, applicants were pointing out the differences between the claimed invention and the Gilbert reference, not alleging that Gilbert is non-analogous art. Applicants pointed out that the claims recited accepting a mail address, accepting a keyword, accepting a document file, and extracting data corresponding to the keyword for sending the data to the mail address. Gilbert, by contrast, only discloses formatting text based on an intended email recipient.

Thus, the gist of applicants' argument was that a disclosure simply of formatting text cannot render obvious the claimed steps of accepting a keyword, accepting a document file, and extracting data corresponding to the keyword.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that the claims do not recite "searching" the document file for the keyword. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, because "extracting data corresponding to the keyword from the document file" inherently requires searching the document for the keyword so that data corresponding thereto can be extracted. However, to expedite allowance of this application, applicants have amended the claims to include "searching the document file for the keyword."

In paragraph 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner explains his interpretation of "keyword" as a text-based delimiter used as a key. The Examiner's definition of keyword is not reasonable in light of the specification of this application or the claimed relationship between the claimed keyword and the extracted data. As the Examiner notes, applicants' disclosure states "the data extracting unit 21 . . . searches the file for a character string (keyword) corresponding

to each receiver.” This disclosure makes clear that the keyword is a search term and is wholly different than the text formatting of Gilbert. To the extent that Gilbert teaches searching for embedded processing codes in a message, the code does not include corresponding data for subsequent extraction as claimed by applicants.

Further, combining Gilbert with Kohler would not have rendered the claims obvious, because, as stated above, Gilbert does not teach a keyword used to search for corresponding data for subsequent extraction as claimed by applicants. Similarly, Kohler does not teach a keyword used to search for corresponding data for subsequent extraction.

To render a claim prima facie obvious, the cited references must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. MPEP 2143. The Examiner has not established prima facie obviousness because the cited references, alone and in combination, fail to disclose a keyword used to search a file for corresponding data for subsequent extraction as claimed by applicants. Thus, prima facie obviousness has not been established and the rejection under section 103(a) must be withdrawn.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952, referencing Attorney Docket No. 325772026100.

Dated: June 23, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Jill DeMello Hill

Registration No.: 42,477

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300

McLean, Virginia 22102

(703) 760-7718